

US Serial No.: 09/830,306

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Official Action dated April 13, 2004, wherein the Examiner rejected pending claims 1-7 and 13-19, in view of Ozawa, US Patent No. 5,305,332, either separately or in further view of Yeldener et al., US Patent No. 5,774,837. The Examiner has further generally objected to claims 8-12 and 20-26 as being multiple dependent upon a multiple dependent claim, and accordingly has not examined the same on the merits. The Examiner has additionally objected to general informalities in the abstract.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner has principally relied upon Ozawa, '332, which relates to a speech decoder for use in reproducing speech, which uses an interpolating circuit to determine a value for a parameter corresponding to a transmission error, which cannot be corrected, based upon an interpolation between parameters of past and future proper frames for use in recovering parameters of a current frame.

However, as presently amended, the references relied upon by the Examiner fail to make known the features of the claims. More specifically, relative to claims 1 and 13, Ozawa, '332, fails to make known or obvious "wherein said one or more speech recognition parameters in said identified group of vectors are replaced by respective replacement parameters corresponding to one or more speech recognition parameters from a vector without error received after said identified group of vectors", where the replacement value for the parameter comes from the corresponding parameter value in the appropriate vector received without error.

Similarly relative to claims 3 and 15, Ozawa, '332, fails to make known or obvious each of the elements of the claims, where more specifically Ozawa, '332, fails to make known or obvious "wherein all the speech recognition parameters of each vector of said group are replaced by replacing the whole vectors, and each respective replaced whole vector is replaced by a copy of whichever of the preceding or following vector without error is closest in receipt order to the vector being replaced".

Yeldener et al., '837, fails to provide a suitable teaching or suggestion, which would account for the missing elements identified above.

New claims 27 and 29, differ from the references cited by the Examiner, where the claims identify specific types of parameters associated with speech recognition (i.e. mel cepstral

US Serial No.: 09/830,306

coefficients), as opposed to parameters associated with encoded speech, which is to be reproduced.

In connection with rejecting claims 7 and 19, the Examiner has attempted to take official notice relative to the replacement of all parameters, relative to having a number of errors within a frame too numerous to recover the individual parameters. The applicants, however, traverse the Examiner's attempt to take official notice and request that the Examiner provide a citation to a reference supporting the assertion. Furthermore, the applicants require that the Examiner relate the alleged teaching to the claimed context, where a motivation to combine with the other alleged teachings is necessary to support the assertions of such a rejection, and where it is further necessary to relate the alleged well known context where the errors are too numerous to recover individual parameters with the claimed context where a specified number of parameters is exceeded, which have values that do not fall within a predetermined threshold relative to their respective predicted value. If the parameters are unrecoverable as the Examiner has suggested, how could they be compared against a predetermined threshold relative to a respective predicted value for purposes of making known or obvious the corresponding claims?

Furthermore, relative to claims 8-12 and 20-26, to the extent that they have not been canceled, have been amended so as to no longer include a multiple dependency upon another claim including a multiple dependency. Consequently, it would now be appropriate for the Examiner to minimally address the merits of the same.

In responding to the Examiner's concerns relative to the abstract, the applicants have amended the abstract to avoid the identified language.

The applicants would contend, that the claims are allowable over the prior art of record for the reasons noted. The applicants would request that the Examiner reconsider and reexamine the claims in view of the above noted reasons. Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

US Serial No.: 09/830,306

In the event, that there are any remaining unresolved issues precluding the issuance of the present application after consideration of the present response, before issuing a further rejection, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the applicants' agent at the below listed number to discuss the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BY: Lawrence J. Chapa
Lawrence J. Chapa
Reg. No. 39,135
Phone (847) 523-0340
Fax. No. (847) 523-2350

Motorola, Inc.
Personal Communications Sector
Intellectual Property Department
600 North US Highway 45, RM AS437
Libertyville, IL 60048